

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMER United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE SON-1582/SUG 8128 11/24/1999 MASUMITSU INO 09/424,544

> 7590 10/21/2004

RONALD P KANANEN RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER THE LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET NW SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER PIZIALI, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|------|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/424,544 | INO ET AL. | | | |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Jeff Piziali | 2673 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | orrespondence add | ress | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 22 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | • | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>04 February 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | |
| (a) ⊠. they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | |
| (d) 🖾 they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | , | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: 13 and 14. | | | • | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 3,5-7,11,13-20,23-29,31,37 and 43 | 1 <u>-48</u> . | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | ٠ | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | |
| | (| 20 | | | |
| | | 7 J.F. 15 October 2004 | | | |

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed "fourth" amendment, if entered, would newly introduce for instance the limitations of "the gate of the first transistor being continuously connected to the supply line via a storage capacitor and being connected to the gate of the second transistor via a switch device which is operable to connect the gates of the first and second transistors during the address period" to independent claim 1. Such limitations, if incorporated into present claim language, would dramatically alter inventive scope of the claims, requiring additional search and consideration. By such reasoning, non-entry of the "fourth" amendment is deemed proper and necessary at this time.

Moreover, the proposed "fifth" amendment, if entered, would present additional claims (61-66) without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. By such reasoning, nonentry of the "fifth" proposed amendment is deemed necessary and proper at this time.

BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TO 101 ORV CENTER 2600

Notification of Non-Compliance With 37 CFR 1.192(c)

| Application No. 09/424,544 | Applicant(s) INO ET AL. | E |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Jeff Piziali | 2673 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on <u>22 July 2004</u> is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three TIME PERIODS: (1) ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) TWO MONTHS from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.

The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper

| | | heading or in the proper order. |
|----|-------------|---|
| 2. | | The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)). |
| 3. | | At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)). |
| 1. | | The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)). |
| 5. | | The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)). |
| 3. | | A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and |
| | (a) | the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief. |
| | (b) | the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fal together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief. |
| 7. | | The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)) |
| 3. | \boxtimes | The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)). |
| 9. | \boxtimes | Other (including any explanation in support of the above items): |
| | | The "APPELLANT'S RPIEE" (Paper No. 20, filed 22, July 2004) procents a Claim Appendix (see Pages 15, 19 of the Priofi |

The "APPELLANT'S BRIEF" (Paper No. 29, filed 22 July 2004) presents a Claim Appendix (see Pages 15-18 of the Brief) that assumes entry of at least the proposed "FOURTH AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL ACTION (37 C.F.R.1.116)." However, as explained in the concurrently mailed Advisory Action (Paper No. 31), the proposed amendment (Paper No. 30, filed 22 July 2004), if entered, would introduce new issues requiring additional search and consideration. Therefore, nonentry of the proposed amendment is deemed necessary and proper at this time. And for such reason, the Brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto.

It should be noted the above reason for non-compliance is the same reason for non-compliance mailed 21 July 2004 (Paper No. 28). Moreover, 37 CFR 1.192 states, "If a brief is filed which does not comply with all the requirements of paragraph (c) of this section, appellant will be notified of the reasons for non-compliance and provided with a period of one month within which to file an amended brief. If appellant does not file an amended brief during the one-month period, or files an amended brief which does not overcome all the reasons for non-compliance stated in the notification, the appeal will stand dismissed."

BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

15 October 2004